

Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Plan and Business Case Summary

Part I: Summary Information And Justification (All Capital Assets)

Section A: Overview (All Capital Assets)

1. **Date of Submission:** 2010-03-17 14:54:14
2. **Agency:** 021
3. **Bureau:** 12
4. **Name of this Investment:** FAAXX032: Terminal Automation Replacement System (STARS)
5. **Unique Project (Investment) Identifier:** 021-12-01-11-01-1020-00
6. **What kind of investment will this be in FY 2011?:** Mixed Life Cycle
 - Planning
 - Full Acquisition
 - Operations and Maintenance
 - Mixed Life Cycle
 - Multi-Agency Collaboration
7. **What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB? ***
8. **Provide a brief summary and justification for this investment, including a brief description of how this closes in part or in whole an identified agency performance gap; this description may include links to relevant information which should include relevant GAO reports, and links to relevant findings of independent audits.**

STATUS: STARS is a digital radar/flight data processing and display system used by terminal air traffic controllers to ensure the safety of military and civilian aircraft throughout the nation's airspace. On February 18, 2009 the JRC recognized that the Norfolk, VA TRACON is the final STARS deployment. Norfolk achieved IOC in June 2007. While 47 STARS "systems" have been procured under this phase (TAMR Phase I), the FAA Joint Resources Council recently allowed the reclassification of one TRACON site to a remote tower. Since the equipment for this site, Dayton, has already been purchased, the JRC action will not result in a reduction in the number of sites. Instead, the site count will remain at 47 and the equipment purchased for Dayton "tower" will be installed as part of the already deployed Port Columbus TRACON. Towers are associated with TRACONS and as such do not have "IOC dates" assigned. The newly designated Dayton, OH, tower will become a remote tower associated with the Port Columbus, OH, TRACON, which became operational in April 2004. Once the remote display is installed in the new Tower in Dayton in FY2010, STARS will be 100% complete. STARS is still characterized as a "Mixed Life-Cycle" program for OMB purposes due to the continued use of F&E funding. It is also important to understand that STARS is now in the "In-Service" phase of its acquisition life-cycle. BACKGROUND: STARS has been a "joint" Department of Defense (DoD) / Department of Transportation (DOT) program since inception in 1996. The joint program reduces the government's cost of ownership by cutting duplicate development, logistics, training, sustainment and technology refreshment costs. This exhibit includes only the FAA's costs & benefits & does not capture joint benefits. For more information on the DoD air traffic control automation program, see DoD's OMB-300 @ UPI 007-57-05-12-01-6177-00-118-060. SUMMARY: During FY2011, STARS "terminal automation enhancements" and "technology refreshment" activities will enable the Agency to meet future operational requirements and address hardware and commercial end-of-life issues, sustain operational suitability, incorporate future operational requirements and keep the system running reliably.

 - a. **Provide here the date of any approved rebaselining within the past year, the date for the most recent (or planned) alternatives analysis for this investment, and whether this investment has a risk management plan and risk register.**

9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? *

a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval? *

10. Contact information of Program/Project Manager?

- **Name:** *
- **Phone Number:** *
- **Email:** *

11. What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per FAC-P/PM)? *

- Project manager has been validated according to FAC-PMPM or DAWIA criteria as qualified for this investment.
- Project manager qualifications according to FAC-P/PM or DAWIA criteria is under review for this investment.
- Project manager assigned to investment, but does not meet requirements according to FAC-P/OM or DAWIA criteria.
- Project manager assigned but qualification status review has not yet started.
- No project manager has yet been assigned to this investment.

12. If this investment is a financial management system, then please fill out the following as reported in the most recent financial systems inventory (FMSI):

Financial management system name(s)	System acronym	Unique Project Identifier (UPI) number
*	*	*

a. If this investment is a financial management system AND the investment is part of the core financial system then select the primary FFMIA compliance area that this investment addresses (choose only one): *

- computer system security requirement;
- internal control system requirement;
- core financial system requirement according to FSIO standards;
- Federal accounting standard;
- U.S. Government Standard General Ledger at the Transaction Level;
- this is a core financial system, but does not address a FFMIA compliance area;
- Not a core financial system; does not need to comply with FFMIA

Section B: Summary of Funding (Budget Authority for Capital Assets)

1.

Table 1: SUMMARY OF FUNDING FOR PROJECT PHASES (REPORTED IN MILLIONS) (Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)									
	PY1 and earlier	PY 2009	CY 2010	BY 2011	BY+1 2012	BY+2 2013	BY+3 2014	BY+4 and beyond	Total
Planning:	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Acquisition:	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Operations & Maintenance:	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Disposition Costs (optional):	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
SUBTOTAL:	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.									
Government FTE Costs	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
TOTAL(including FTE costs)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

2. If the summary of funding has changed from the FY 2010 President's Budget request, briefly explain those changes:

*

Section C: Acquisition/Contract Strategy (All Capital Assets)

1.

Table 1: Contracts/Task Orders Table

Contract or Task Order Number	Type of Contract/Task Order (In accordance with FAR Part 16)	Has the contract been awarded (Y/N)	If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Start date of Contract/Task Order	End date of Contract/Task Order	Total Value of Contract/Task Order (M)	Is this an Interagency Acquisition? (Y/N)	Is it performance based? (Y/N)	Competitively awarded? (Y/N)	What, if any, alternative financing option is being used? (ESPC, UESC, EUL, N/A)	Is EVM in the contract? (Y/N)
DTFA01-00-C-00068	T&M (F&E)	Y	2000-08-16	2000-08-16	2010-08-16	\$0.2	*	*	*	*	*
DTFA01-96-C-03008	CPFF	Y	2009-10-01	2009-10-01	2011-03-31	\$47.0	*	*	*	*	*
DTFAWA-09-C-00039	CPFF	Y	2009-04-30	2009-04-30	2013-05-31	\$1.2	*	*	*	*	*
DTFAWA-09-C-00042	CPFF	Y	2009-04-30	2009-04-30	2013-05-31	\$0.3	*	*	*	*	*
DTFAWA-09-C-00041	CPFF	Y	2009-06-10	2009-06-10	2011-04-30	\$0.8	*	*	*	*	*
DTFAWA-09-C-00040	CPFF	Y	2009-04-30	2009-04-30	2013-05-31	\$0.3	*	*	*	*	*
DTFAWA-09-C-00052	CPFF	Y	2009-06-10	2009-06-10	2011-06-10	\$0.4	*	*	*	*	*
DTFAWA-09-C-00053	CPFF	Y	2009-04-30	2009-04-30	2011-06-09	\$1.2	*	*	*	*	*

2. If earned value is not required or will not be a contract requirement for any of the contracts or task orders above, explain why:

*

3. Is there an acquisition plan which reflects the requirements of FAR Subpart 7.1 and has been approved in accordance with agency requirements? *

a. If "yes," what is the date? *

Section D: Performance Information (All Capital Assets)

Table 1: Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2005	Mobility	*	*	STARS System Availability (%)	Availability of system before STARS: 99.9845% (ARTS IIE - 2004)	Target 99.9890% availability at 37 STARS sites 15.6% sites supported (27 of 167) in FY04	99.994% availability at 37 sites
2005	Reduced Congestion	*	*	Percentage of on time arrivals	On time arrivals are for the 35 Operational Evolution Plan (OEP) airports was at 87.2% in FY04.	Improvement in on time arrivals (from 87.2% to 87.4%)	Achieved on-time arrival rate of 87.40%
2005	Safety	*	*	Number of category A&B operational errors.	656 category A&B operational errors in FY 2004	3% reduction in category A&B operational errors (to 636).	STARS contributed to FAA meeting 5 of 8 safety goals
2005	Safety	*	*	Percentage of planned sites upgraded with increased security features and an approved SCAP	27 (of 50) systems with an approved SCAP	37/47 of former ARTS/CARTS sites will have an approved SCAP.	STARS has been deployed to 37 of 47 planned sites. All deployed STARS sites have an approved SCAP.
2005	Mobility	*	*	STARS System Availability (%)	Maintain 99.95% or better availability at former ARTS IIIA sites	.999890 availability at 37 STARS sites	99.994% availability at 37 former ARTS IIIA sites.
2006	Reduced Congestion	*	*	Aircraft Direct Operating Costs (ADOC) Benefits	Aircraft Direct Operating Costs (ADOC) Benefits = 0	Aircraft Direct Operating Costs (ADOC) Benefits = \$100K	This goal is being removed because it was not part of the original business case for the STARS program.
2006	Reduced Congestion	*	*	Savings in terminal area delays.	In 2005 there were 35 flight delays caused by the predecessor system.	Cost Avoidance - \$27.4M	This goal is being removed because it was not part of the original business case for the STARS program.
2006	Reduced Congestion	*	*	Passenger Value of Time (PVT) Benefits	Passenger Value of Time (PVT) Benefits = 0	Passenger Value of Time (PVT) Benefits = \$100K	This goal is being removed because it was not part of the original business case for the STARS program.
2006	Reduced Congestion	*	*	On time Arrivals	On time arrivals are for the 35 Operational	Improvement in on time arrivals (from 87.4% to	No flight delays or interruptions attributable to

Table 1: Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
					Evolution Plan (OEP) airports was at 87.2% in FY04.	87.7%).	STARS
2006	Reduced Congestion	*	*	Computer Memory and Data Processing Margins	Insufficient margin in computer memory and data processing capacity to allow the implementation of: surface movement strategies and infrastructure e.g., SMA & SMS, ADS-B, TIS-B, FIS-B, ASDE-X and PRM.	93.6% (44/47) of STARS sites will have an initial 50% margin in computer memory	44/47 sites deployed with 50% computer memory margin.
2006	Security	*	*	Percentage of planned sites upgraded with enhanced security features.	ARTS/CARTS SCAP contingent upon replacement by STARS	Deploy STARS with security features that close the identified security gaps.	No CSIRC reports of system degradation
2006	Reduced Congestion	*	*	STARS System Availability (%)	ARTS IIIA Availability = 99.989%, CATS IIE Availability = 99.987%	Target 99.9890% availability at 44 (of 47) STARS sites	Average STARS availability since 2003 is 99.999%
2007	Reduced Congestion	*	*	Computer Memory and Data Processing Margins	Insufficient margin in ARTS/CARTS computer memory and data processing capacity for functional and infrastructure improvements	46/47 STARS sites will have an initial margin in computer memory and data processing capacity.	STARS margin measured on Nov 7, 2007 between 40% and 60%
2007	Reduced Congestion	*	*	On time arrivals.	On time arrivals are for the 35 Operational Evolution Plan (OEP) airports was at 87.2%	Improvement in on time arrivals (from 87.4% to 87.7%)	86.71% (No problems with on-time arrivals are attributable to STARS for 2007.)
2007	Security	*	*	Percentage of planned sites upgraded with enhanced security features.	ARTS/CARTS SCAP contingent upon replacement by STARS	Deploy STARS with security features that close the identified security gaps.	STARS SCAP approved in August 2007
2007	Safety	*	*	Increased availability and capacity	ARTS IIIA availability = 99.989%. CARTS IIE availability = 99.987%	97.87% (46/47) of STARS sites will have cumulative equipment availability of 99.9995% or greater	STARS Equipment Availability is measured at 99.9997% for 2007.
2008	Safety	*	*	Average number of	Number of general aviation	Contribute to a reduction in	Actual results will not be

Table 1: Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
				general aviation and nonscheduled Part 135 fatal accidents over a three-year period.	and nonscheduled Part 135 fatal accidents is 385, which represents the average number of fatal accidents for baseline period of 1996-1998.	general aviation and nonscheduled Part 135 fatal accidents to no more than 325 over a three-year period.	available until 2Q/FY11
2008	Reduced Congestion	*	*	Computer Memory and Data Processing Margins	Insufficient margin in computer memory and data processing capacity for functional and infrastructure improvements	46 (of 47) of STARS sites sustain a margin in computer memory and data processing capacity.	46 STARS sites deployed with spare memory and data processing capacity
2008	Reduced Congestion	*	*	On time arrivals.	On time arrivals are for the 35 Operational Evolution Plan (OEP) airports was at 87.2%	Improvement in on time arrivals (from 87.4% to 87.7%)	Stars contributed to only 2 total flight delays at all 46 sites during FY08. Both were at Orlando.
2008	Safety	*	*	Percentage of planned sites upgraded with an approved SCAP.	ARTS/CARTS SCAP contingent upon replacement by STARS	46 (of 47) of ARTS/CARTS sites will have an approved SCAP.	All 46 STARS sites were deployed with an approved SCAP.
2008	Safety	*	*	STARS System Availability (%)	ARTS IIIA availability = 99.989% CARTS IIE availability = 99.987%	Cumulatively, 97.87% (46/47) of STARS sites will have availability of 99.9995% or greater	STARS FY08 cumulative availability was measured at 99.99998% (FAA Equip. Availability - FY08)
2009	Safety	*	*	Average number of general aviation and nonscheduled Part 135 fatal accidents over a three-year period.	Number of general aviation and nonscheduled Part 135 fatal accidents is 385, which represents the average number of fatal accidents for baseline period of 1996-1998.	No fatal accidents directly attributable to STARS	NOT MET YET: Actual results will not be available until 2Q/FY10
2009	Reduced Congestion	*	*	Computer Memory and Data Processing Margins	Insufficient margin in computer memory and data processing capacity for functional and infrastructure improvements	46 (of 47) of STARS sites sustain a margin in computer memory and data processing capacity.	NOT MET YET: Actual results will not be available until 2Q/FY10
2009	Reduced	*	*	On time arrivals.	On time arrivals	No more than	NOT MET YET:

Table 1: Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	Congestion				are for the 35 Operational Evolution Plan (OEP) airports was at 87.2% in FY04	ten flight delays directly attributable to STARS	Actual results will not be available until 2Q/FY10
2009	Security	*	*	Percentage of planned sites upgraded with an approved SCAP.	ARTS/CARTS SCAP contingent upon replacement by STARS	46 (of 47) of ARTS/CARTS sites will have an approved SCAP.	NOT MET YET: Actual results will not be available until 2Q/FY10
2009	Safety	*	*	STARS System Availability (%)	ARTS IIIA availability = 99.989% CARTS IIE availability = 99.987%	Cumulatively, 97.87% (46/47) of STARS sites will have availability of 99.9995% or greater.	NOT MET YET: Actual results will not be available until 2Q/FY10
2010	Safety	*	*	Average number of general aviation and nonscheduled Part 135 fatal accidents over a three-year period.	Number of general aviation and nonscheduled Part 135 fatal accidents is 385, which represents the average number of fatal accidents for baseline period of 1996-1998.	No fatal accidents directly attributable to STARS	Actual results will not be available until 2Q/FY11
2010	Reduced Congestion	*	*	Computer Memory and Data Processing Margins	Insufficient margin in computer memory and data processing capacity for functional and infrastructure improvements	46 (of 47) of STARS sites sustain a margin in computer memory and data processing capacity.	Actual results will not be available until 2Q/FY11
2010	Reduced Congestion	*	*	On time arrivals.	On time arrivals are for the 35 Operational Evolution Plan (OEP) airports was at 87.2% in FY04	STARS contributes to the NAS goals of (1) improvement in on time arrivals (from 87.4% to 87.7%)	Actual results will not be available until 2Q/FY11
2010	Security	*	*	Percentage of planned sites upgraded with an approved SCAP.	ARTS/CARTS SCAP contingent upon replacement by STARS	46 (of 47) of ARTS/CARTS sites will have an approved SCAP.	Actual results will not be available until 2Q/FY11
2010	Safety	*	*	STARS System Availability (%)	ARTS IIIA availability = 99.989% CARTS IIE availability = 99.987%	Cumulatively, 97.87% (46/47) of STARS sites will have availability of 99.9995% or greater.	Actual results will not be available until 2Q/FY11
2011	Security	*	*	STARS Security Breaches	Zero STARS Security Breaches	Zero	Actual results will not be available until 2Q/FY12

Table 1: Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2011	Safety	*	*	STARS Equipment Availability (%)	99.9995	99.9995	Actual results will not be available until 2Q/FY12
2011	Reduced Congestion	*	*	Computer Data Processing Margins	Zero system outages due to data processing margins	Zero	Actual results will not be available until 2Q/FY12
2011	Reduced Congestion	*	*	Flight Delays due to STARS	2006: 110 flight delays due to STARS	less than 10	Actual results will not be available until 2Q/FY12
2012	Security	*	*	STARS Security Breaches	Zero STARS Security Beaches	Zero	Actual results will not be available until 2Q/FY13
2012	Safety	*	*	STARS Equipment Availability (%)	99.9995	99.9995	Actual results will not be available until 2Q/FY13
2012	Reduced Congestion	*	*	Computer Data Processing Margins	Zero system outages due to data processing margins	Zero	Actual results will not be available until 2Q/FY13
2012	Reduced Congestion	*	*	Flight Delays due to STARS	2006: 110 flight delays due to STARS	less than 10	Actual results will not be available until 2Q/FY13
2013	Security	*	*	STARS Security Breaches	Zero STARS Security Beaches	Zero	Actual results will not be available until 2Q/FY14
2013	Safety	*	*	STARS Equipment Availability (%)	99.9995	99.9995	Actual results will not be available until 2Q/FY14
2013	Reduced Congestion	*	*	Computer Data Processing Margins	Zero system outages due to data processing margins	Zero	Actual results will not be available until 2Q/FY14
2013	Reduced Congestion	*	*	Flight Delays due to STARS	2006: 110 flight delays due to STARS	less than 10	Actual results will not be available until 2Q/FY14
2014	Security	*	*	STARS Security Breaches	Zero STARS Security Beaches	Zero	Actual results will not be available until 2Q/FY15
2014	Safety	*	*	STARS Equipment Availability (%)	99.9995	99.9995	Actual results will not be available until 2Q/FY15
2014	Reduced Congestion	*	*	Computer Data Processing Margins	Zero system outages due to data processing margins	Zero	Actual results will not be available until 2Q/FY15
2014	Reduced Congestion	*	*	Flight Delays due to STARS	2006: 110 flight delays due to STARS	less than 10	Actual results will not be available until 2Q/FY15

Table 1: Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2015	Security	*	*	STARS Security Breaches	Zero STARS Security Beaches	Zero	Actual results will not be available until 2Q/FY16
2015	Safety	*	*	STARS Equipment Availability (%)	99.9995	99.9995	Actual results will not be available until 2Q/FY16
2015	Reduced Congestiioj	*	*	Computer Data Processing Margins	Zero system outages due to data processing margins	Zero	Actual results will not be available until 2Q/FY16
2015	Reduced Congestion	*	*	Flight Delays due to STARS	2006: 110 flight delays due to STARS	less than 10	Actual results will not be available until 2Q/FY16

Part II: Planning, Acquisition And Performance Information

Section A: Cost and Schedule Performance (All Capital Assets)

1. Comparison of Actual Work Completed and Actual Costs to Current Approved Baseline								
Description of Milestones	Planned Cost (\$M)	Actual Cost (\$M)	Planned Start Date	Actual Start Date	Planned Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Planned Percent Complete	Actual Percent Complete
(S18) Final Investment Decision (FID)	\$17.1	\$17.1	1994-10-01	1994-10-01	1995-06-02	1995-06-02	100.00%	100.00%
(S25) Critical Design Review (CDR)	\$31.6	\$31.6	1995-10-01	1995-10-01	1996-07-10	1996-07-10	100.00%	100.00%
(S26) Product Demonstration Decision	\$416.3	\$416.3	1996-10-01	1996-10-01	1999-12-10	1999-12-10	100.00%	100.00%
(S30) Development Test & Evaluation (DT&E)	\$201.7	\$201.7	1999-10-01	1999-10-01	2000-06-26	2000-06-26	100.00%	100.00%
(S31) Operational Test & Evaluation (OT&E)	\$190.5	\$190.5	2000-10-01	2000-10-01	2002-04-30	2002-04-30	100.00%	100.00%
(S35) Production Decision	\$179.7	\$179.7	2001-10-01	2001-10-01	2002-11-17	2002-11-17	100.00%	100.00%
(S43) In-Service Decision	\$135.5	\$135.5	2002-10-01	2002-10-01	2003-05-15	2003-05-15	100.00%	100.00%
(S-53) Last TRACON Site IOC (Norfolk)	\$354.0	\$350.9	2003-10-01	2003-10-01	2007-09-21	2007-06-23	100.00%	100.00%
Dayton Tower SRC	\$1.9	\$1.2	2008-06-09	2008-06-09	2009-08-19	2009-09-04	100.00%	100.00%
Tech Refresh & Terminal Enhancements 2006-2008	\$73.3	\$73.3	2005-10-01	2005-10-01	2008-09-30	2008-09-30	100.00%	100.00%
Tech Refresh & Terminal Enhancements 2009	\$35.6	\$33.4	2008-10-01	2008-10-01	2009-09-30	2009-09-30	100.00%	100.00%
Tech Refresh & Terminal Enhancements 2010 (SW R20 & R21)	\$35.8	\$15.5	2009-10-01	2009-10-01	2010-09-30		44.70%	40.68%
Tech Refresh & Terminal Enhancements 2011	*	*	2010-10-01		2011-09-30		0.00%	0.00%
Tech Refresh & Terminal Enhancements 2012-2014	*	*	2011-10-01		2014-09-30		0.00%	0.00%
Tech Refresh & Terminal	*	*	2014-10-01		2031-09-30		0.00%	0.00%

1. Comparison of Actual Work Completed and Actual Costs to Current Approved Baseline								
Description of Milestones	Planned Cost (\$M)	Actual Cost (\$M)	Planned Start Date	Actual Start Date	Planned Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Planned Percent Complete	Actual Percent Complete
Enhancements 2015 and Beyond								
Operations and Maintenance (O&M, 2008 and earlier)	\$163.5	\$163.5	2002-10-01	2002-10-01	2008-09-30	2008-09-30	100.00%	100.00%
Operations and Maintenance (O&M, 2009)	\$50.4	\$50.4	2008-10-01	2008-10-01	2009-09-30	2009-09-30	100.00%	100.00%
Operations and Maintenance (O&M, 2010)	\$52.6	\$35.0	2009-10-01	2009-10-01	2010-09-30		66.67%	66.67%
Operations and Maintenance (O&M, 2011)	*	*	2010-10-01		2011-09-30		0.00%	0.00%
Operations and Maintenance (O&M, 2012)	*	*	2011-10-01		2012-09-30		0.00%	0.00%
Operations and Maintenance (O&M, 2013)	*	*	2012-10-01		2013-09-30		0.00%	0.00%
Operations and Maintenance (O&M, 2014)	*	*	2013-10-01		2014-09-30		0.00%	0.00%
Operations and Maintenance (O&M, 2015 and Beyond)	*	*	2014-10-01		2031-09-30		0.00%	0.00%

* - Indicates data is redacted.